## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

THOMAS WALKER, et al.,	) Coss No. 2:14 av. 01475 IAD NIK
Plaintiff(s),	) Case No. 2:14-cv-01475-JAD-NJK
	) ORDER
VS.	) ) (Docket No. 150)
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, et al.,	) (Docket No. 130)
Defendant(s).	}
	)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' renewed motion for an order fixing expert witness fees. Docket No. 150. The Court denied Plaintiffs' initial motion because it failed to show that "[a] prefiling conference between counsel that includes personal consultation" had been conducted. Docket No. 146 (citing Local Rule 26-7(c) and Local Rule IA 1-3(f)). Plaintiffs' renewed motion indicates that their counsel sent a letter to opposing counsel and that a responsive letter has been received. Docket No. 150-1 at ¶¶ 10, 14. As the previously cited rules make clear, the exchange of these letters is not sufficient to satisfy the pre-filing conference requirement because it lacks "personal consultation":

Unless these rules or a court order provides otherwise, this requirement [to meet and confer] may only be satisfied through direct dialogue and discussion in a face-to-face meeting, telephone conference, or video exchange. The exchange of written, electronic, or voice-mail communications does not satisfy this requirement.

Local Rule IA 1-3(f) (emphasis added).

Because the renewed motion for an order fixing expert witness fees continues to fail to establish that a sufficient pre-filing conference was conducted, it is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**DATED:** August 14, 2017

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge